1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Richard Lyon (Cal. Bar No. 229288) rick@dovel.com Christin Cho (CBN 238173) christin@dovel.com DOVEL & LUNER, LLP 201 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 600 Santa Monica, California 90401 Telephone: (310) 656-7066 Facsimile: (310) 656-7069 Attorneys for Plaintiff	
10	LINITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
11		TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12		
13	EDIE GOLIKOV, individually and	Case No. 2:24-cv-08211-RGK-MAR
14	on behalf of all others similarly situated,	DECLARATION OF RICK LYON IN
15	$Dl_{\alpha int} iff$	SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO WALMART'S
16	Plaintiff,	MOTION TO CLARIFY OR TO
17	v.	DECERTIFY CLASS
18	WALMART INC.,	Date: July 28, 2025
19	Defendant.	Time: 9:00 a.m. Ctrm.: 850
20	Dejenaani.	Cum. 650
21		Assigned to the Hon. R. Gary Klausner
22		Complaint filed: September 24, 2024
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

DECLARATION OF RICK LYON

- I, Rick Lyon, declare and state as follows:
- 1. I am a member in good standing of the bar of the state of California and a partner in the law firm of Dovel & Luner LLP. I represent Plaintiff Edie Golikov in the above-referenced matter and am lead counsel for Ms. Golikov in this matter.
- 2. After the Arbitration Order (Dkt. 81), the parties discussed its implications. It was clear that the parties' views differed, and we required clarification from the Court. Walmart maintained that the class had been sub silentio decertified by the Court's Arbitration Order. We maintained that the class claims remain intact and that we should be permitted to substitute in a substitute class representative. Because both parties sought clarification, we discussed possible ways to present this request for clarification to the Court. It was decided that Walmart would set forth its requested clarification in its motion to clarify or decertify, and we would set forth Plaintiff's requested clarification in response to the motion.
- 3. During our meet and confers, I further informed counsel of my preplanned vacation with my family, and counsel agreed to notice the hearing date so that time for Plaintiff's response would not conflict with my family trip. But when Walmart filed its motion, counsel noticed the hearing date 28 days out instead of 35 days out, which inadvertently created the conflict we sought to avoid. *See* Judge Klausner's Standing Order at 3, para 6 ("the notice of motion shall be filed with the Clerk not later than twenty-eight (28) days, and no earlier than thirty-five (35) days, before the date set for hearing). Walmart's counsel therefore agreed to re-notice the hearing date for a week later, i.e., 35 days from the filing of the motion instead of 28 days (from July 28 to August 4). *See* Dkt. 83 (Amended Notice). The parties believed that the re-noticed hearing date was permissible (it still fell within the 28 to 35 day range required by the Court's Standing Order) and would automatically

2

3

8

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

22

24 25

26 27

move back the deadline for Plaintiff's response by one week (from July 7 to July 14). See C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-9 (opposition papers due 21 days before designated date for hearing). This past Friday, however, the Court struck the Amended Notice, and retained the original July 28, hearing date. Dkt. 85. Although the original response deadline had passed by this time, we are filing this response the very next business day.

Document 86-1

- 4. Based on the Court's Order striking the Amended Notice, it appears the better course to effectuate the parties' agreement would have been for Walmart to withdraw its original motion (with the July 28, hearing date) and re-file the amended motion (with the August 4, hearing date) instead of just filing the amended notice of motion. But the parties made a good faith effort to comply with what they understood to be the proper way to push back the briefing schedule by one week. We respectfully request that Plaintiff's response be fully considered by the Court in light of the foregoing explanation. See, e.g., Ryan v. Editions Ltd. W., Inc., No. C 06-04812 PVT, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 70853, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2009) (granting like relief when counsel incorrectly "believed that the parties could stipulate to change the hearing date"). Ahanchian is also instructive. There, the Ninth Circuit held that it was an abuse of discretion not to extend the briefing deadlines that allowed for "a mere eight days, three over the Labor Day weekend, to draft [the] oppositions to the motions" while counsel "were out of town." Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc., 624 F.3d 1253, 1256, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010). Similarly, here, before re-noticing the hearing date, Plaintiff's counsel was provided with a mere seven days, three of which were over the Independence Day weekend, while counsel was out of country.
- 5. Attached as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of Tommy Reed, Walmart's Merchandising Director, filed on May 8, 2024 in Hawkins v. Walmart Inc. et al., No. 1:24-CV-00374-KES-SKO in the Eastern District of California.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 14th day of July, 2025, at Santa Monica, California.

Rick Lyon:

EXHIBIT 1

Case No. 1:24-CV-00374-KES-SKO

Page 6 of 8 Page ID

DECLARATION OF TOMMY REED

- I, Tommy Reed, declare and state as follows:
- 1. I have been employed by Walmart Inc. (Walmart) for 27 years. I am a Merchandising Director. In this capacity, my responsibilities include general supervision of a variety of customer products, including Great Value Avocado Oil, that are offered for sale by Walmart in stores and online. In my role I have knowledge of and involvement in record keeping, sales information, and other information that assists Walmart in meeting customer demand for Great Value Avocado Oil and other products.
- 2. Based on my job responsibilities, I am familiar with Walmart's recordkeeping for the products it offers for sale to consumers. Walmart, in its ordinary course of doing business, keeps and maintains records of its products and sales. Those records are made by or from information transmitted by a person with knowledge of the event described therein at or near the time of the event described and are kept in the ordinary course of the regularly conducted business activity of that person and Walmart, and it is the regular practice of Walmart to make such records. The matters stated herein are true as to my own personal knowledge and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to the information set forth herein.
- 3. I have access to Walmart's business records relating to its sales and products, and have reviewed records necessary to provide the information in this declaration. Based on information from Walmart's sales database, Walmart has generated more than \$3,000,000 in sales revenue from the sale of Great Value Avocado Oil in California brick-and-mortar stores from February 29, 2020, through February 29, 2024. This number represents the aggregate purchase price paid by consumers for sales of Great Value Avocado Oil in California brick-and-mortar stores from February 29, 2020, through February 29, 2024.

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

\\

 \parallel

 \parallel

 \parallel

26

27

28

Page 8 of 8 Page ID

Filed 07/14/25

DocuSign Envelope II ... 586C6416-3E56-1A84-91C1M57R52D69766cument 86-1